

**SEP 09 2024**

David W. Slayton, Executive Officer/Clerk of Court

By: C. King, Deputy

1 Joseph R. Manning, Jr., Esq. (State Bar No. 223381)  
2 **MANNING LAW, APC**  
3 26100 Towne Centre Drive  
4 Foothill Ranch, CA 92610  
5 Office: (949) 200-8755  
6 Fax: (866) 843-8308  
7 P65@manninglawoffice.com

8 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
9 CALSAFE RESEARCH CENTER, INC.

10  
11  
12 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
13 FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES  
14

15 CALSAFE RESEARCH CENTER,  
16 INC., a California non-profit  
17 corporation

18 Plaintiff,

19 v.

20 VAHDAM TEAS GLOABL, INC., a  
21 Delaware stock corporation; and DOES 1 to  
22 10,

23 Defendants.

Case No. 23TRCV01258

*Assigned for all purposes to: Hon. Ronald F. Frank*

**~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER GRANTING  
PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO CONFIRM  
STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT AS TO  
VAHDAM TEAS GLOABL, INC.**

Date: July 23, 2024

Time: 8:30 AM

Dept.: 8

Reservation ID: 822113951471

Complaint Filed: April 21, 2023

24  
25 On July 23, 2024, at 8:30 AM, Plaintiff CALSAFE RESEARCH CENTER, INC.'s ("CRC")  
26 Motion for Court Approval and Entry of Consent Judgment came on regularly for hearing before this  
27

1 Court in Department 8, the Honorable Ronald F. Frank presiding. After full consideration of the points  
2 and authorities and related pleadings submitted, the Court rules as follows:

3 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion for Court Approval and Entry of Consent  
4 Judgment is GRANTED. Pursuant to and in accordance with *Health & Safety Code* § 25249.7(t)(4),  
5 the Court makes the following findings with respect to the Consent Judgment between CALSAFE  
6 RESEARCH CENTER, INC., and Defendant VAHDAM TEAS GLOABL, INC., in the action *Calsafe*  
7 *Research Center, Inc. v. Vahdam Teas Global, Inc., et al.*, Case No. 23TRCV01258 (the "Consent  
8 Judgment"):  
9

- 10 1. The Consent Judgment ensures compliance with the Proposition 65 warning requirement  
11 (A true and correct copy of the approved Consent Judgment is attached hereto as Exhibit 1);
- 12 2. The attorneys' fee award in the Consent Judgment is reasonable under California law;
- 13 3. The civil penalty in the Consent Judgment is reasonable based on the criteria listed in *Health*  
14 *& Safety Code* § 25249.7(b)(2); and
- 15 4. The amount sought of Plaintiff's costs for testing and bringing this action are reasonable.

16  
17 In light of the findings set forth herein, the Consent Judgment is hereby APPROVED.

18  
19 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

20 Dated: Sept 9, 2024



21   
22 **Hon. Ronald F. Frank**  
23 **Judge of the Superior Court.**